DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 411 788 IR 056 482

AUTHOR Benedict, Marjorie A.
TITLE Costs and Benefits of Faculty Status for Academic Librarians: State University of New York Librarians' Perceptions.
PUB DATE 1997-00-00
NOTE 44p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Libraries; Costs; *Employment Practices; Employment Qualifications; Evaluation Criteria; Higher Education; *Librarian Attitudes; Librarians; *Library Surveys; Promotion (Occupational); Questionnaires
IDENTIFIERS *Faculty Status

ABSTRACT

Surveys conducted in 1982, 1989, and 1992 studied librarians' perceptions of the costs and benefits of faculty status. Respondents from eight campuses representing four types of institutions of the State University of New York system rated eight criteria from the Association of College and Research Libraries "Standards for Faculty Status of College and University Librarians" as costs or benefits. A majority of the participants perceived all of the criteria as benefits. An additional question, "In general, for you as an individual, do the benefits of faculty status outweigh the costs?" also elicited positive responses from a majority of the respondents. The results of these surveys suggest that librarians having faculty status value faculty status and believe that its costs outweigh its benefits. A major concern of the librarians with negative or mixed feelings about faculty status appears to be conditions of employment that often conflict with the librarians' needs and desires to achieve goals related to scholarly and professional activities. Appendices present demographic data and an abstract of the 1989 questionnaire. (Contains 43 references.) (Author)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 411 788

COSTS AND BENEFITS OF FACULTY STATUS FOR ACADEMIC LIBRARIANS: STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK LIBRARIANS' PERCEPTIONS

Marjorie A. Benedict

Associate Librarian

1997

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

University Libraries

The University at Albany, State University of New York
1400 Washington Avenue, Albany, New York 12222

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Marjorie A. Benedict

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)"

IR056482

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

Surveys conducted in 1982, 1989, and 1992 studied librarians' perceptions of the costs and benefits of faculty status. Respondents from eight campuses representing four types of institutions of the State University of New York system rated eight criteria from the ACRL Standards for Faculty Status of College and University Librarians as costs or benefits.

A majority of the participants perceived all of the criteria as benefits. An additional question, "In general, for you as an individual, do the benefits of faculty status outweigh the costs?" also elicited positive responses from a majority of the respondents. The results of these surveys suggest that librarians having faculty status value faculty status and believe that its costs outweigh its benefits. A major concern of the librarians with negative or mixed feelings about faculty status appears to be conditions of employment that often conflict with the librarians' needs and desires to achieve goals related to scholarly and professional activities.

COSTS AND BENEFITS OF FACULTY STATUS:
STATE UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK LIBRARIANS' PERCEPTIONS

By

Marjorie A. Benedict

What are the costs and benefits of faculty status for librarians? The answer depends on the perspective of the person who is contemplating the question. For example, a college or university administrator may perceive the costs and benefits from the institutional point of view, the effect on affirmative action goals, for example. Individual librarians may tend to perceive them on a personal level, in terms of the responsibilities and rewards of the experience. Others may reply to the question from the standpoint of the costs and benefits of faculty status to the profession. Are librarians becoming better educated, more proficient at research, more respected by other campus groups as a result of assuming faculty roles?[1]

Even among librarians in the same library, there can be vast differences of perception. Some of the variables affecting librarians' individual opinions are: the status of librarians at their institutions (are they faculty or not?), the kinds and levels of responsibilities and other professional requirements their status entails, the kinds and levels of institutional support for

their scholarly and professional activities, and the personal experiences and preferences of the individual librarians.

The extent to which the institution observes the Association of College and Research Libraries' criteria for defining librarians' faculty status, Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians (henceforth referred to as the ACRL Standards) may also affect librarians' opinions of the costs and benefits of faculty status.[2] These standards include nine general criteria related to the rights, privileges, and responsibilities of librarians as faculty in the areas of professional responsibilities and self-determination, library governance, college and university governance, compensation, tenure, promotion, research leaves, research funds, and academic freedom. Upon acceptance of these standards in 1971, the membership of ACRL and the American Library Association called for all institutions of higher education to adopt these standards because ". . . college and university librarians must be recognized as equal partners in the academic enterprise, and they must be extended the rights and privileges which are not only commensurate with their contributions, but are necessary if they are to carry out their responsibilities."[3]

Whatever it may mean for a librarian to be a faculty member or an "academic" at an institution of higher education, a majority of colleges and universities have granted faculty and/or academic status to librarians according to the definitions used by those institutions.[4] These institutions have been willing to call

librarians "faculty" or "academic" or both and to give them at least some of the privileges and responsibilities put forth in the ACRL Standards.[5] Most of them, however, seem to have stopped short of implementing the ACRL Standards in their entirety.[6] The standards having to do with equivalent compensation, academic ranks and titles, and academic year appointment appear to be those that are most frequently omitted in the contracts of the librarians.[7]

In the literature of higher education and academic librarianship, some individuals have expressed suspicions that librarians have sought faculty status primarily to improve their image or to obtain the perquisites available to members of the teaching faculty, while being disinclined to accept the accompanying obligations.[8] This may be true of some individuals, but many academic librarians have demonstrated and are continuing to demonstrate that they are willing and able to assume faculty responsibilities and to work for the rewards of academic and/or faculty status.

Some published material related to the costs and benefits of faculty status exists. Various individuals have expressed their personal opinions and some researchers have reported results of surveys that included questions related to the purported responsibilities and rewards of faculty status at the institutions surveyed.[9] At this writing, however, no other results of surveys that focused specifically on librarians' perceptions of the costs and benefits of faculty status appear to have been published in national journals or other widely available sources.

THE SURVEYS

Survey Methodology

In 1982, this investigator and a collaborator, Hanan C. Selvin, were invited to present a paper at the annual conference of the State University of New York Librarians Association (SUNYLA) for which we administered a questionnaire to ascertain the perceptions of faculty status of a representative group of State University of New York (SUNY) librarians. A cooperating librarian in each participating library distributed questionnaires to all of his or her librarian colleagues, then collected and returned the completed questionnaires. We reported the results of that survey at the Association's annual conference in June 1982. In 1989, this investigator repeated the survey to determine, what, if any, changes of opinion may have taken place during the seven years following its first administration. The responses from both surveys were entered into a database and were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) to obtain frequency distributions and cross-tabulations. In 1992, additional narrative comments were solicited from the respondents.

The Survey Populations

The survey populations were drawn from the librarians in eight geographically diverse libraries of the SUNY system. They included two each of four types of institutions: university centers (doctorate-granting institutions), colleges of arts and sciences (institutions offering undergraduate and some master's

programs), two-year community colleges, and graduate/professional schools (represented in these surveys by medical school libraries).[10] The other criterion employed in selecting the sample was the availability of a cooperating librarian in each library to assist in administering the questionnaires. One hundred four librarians responded in 1982 and 88 in 1989, providing response rates of 69% and 62% respectively.

Though there were some differences in the librarians' faculty rights and responsibilities from one institution to another, all or most of the respondents were academic faculty members pursuant to the official policies of the SUNY Board of Trustees. This status includes at least some of the rights, privileges, and responsibilities prescribed in the ACRL Standards.[11]

Both in 1982 and 1989, about one-half of the respondents were employed in libraries at university centers, and about one-sixth in each of the other three types of institutions. Some two-thirds of them were female and one-third male. By primary area of responsibility, 54% of the 1982 respondents and 37% of the 1989 respondents worked in reference and/or collection development, 19% in 1982 and 26% in 1989 were technical services librarians, 14% in 1982 and 17% in 1989 were administrators or supervisors, and 13% in 1982 and 20% in 1989 worked in other areas such as interlibrary loan or circulation.

In both surveys, a majority of the respondents reported that they had earned two master's degrees, one in library science and one in another academic discipline. Seven percent in 1982 and 9%

in 1989 reported having earned a doctorate. Fewer than half indicated that a master's degree in library science was their only graduate degree. In 1982, 65% of the respondents in the university centers and 7% of the respondents in the graduate/professional schools had graduate degrees in addition to the Master's in library science, the highest and lowest percentages by type of institution. Still the highest and lowest percentages in 1989, the former had declined to 53%, (sharing this position with the respondents from the four-year colleges, also 53%), and the latter had risen to 25%.

Eighty percent of the 1982 respondents and 84% of the 1989 respondents had worked in an academic library for five years or longer. A majority had tenure, 56% in 1982 and 66% in 1989. More than half of the respondents in each survey had received one or more promotions in academic rank in their present places of employment. In 1989, more than half held one of the upper ranks of associate librarian, librarian, associate professor, or professor. That same year, 85% had librarian ranks and titles and 11% had professorial ranks and titles. In 1982, 80% had librarian ranks and titles and 20% had "other" ranks and titles, some of which are presumed to have been professorial titles. For further demographic information, see Appendix A.

The Survey Instrument

The questionnaire contained 24 items, eight of which, as indicated above, sought demographic information about the respondents. Eight items had to do with the librarians' satisfaction with faculty status and their commitment to striving

for equitable status as faculty members, and eight items probed their perceptions of the costs and benefits of faculty status. See Appendix B for an abstract of the 1989 questionnaire.

FINDINGS

The surveys revealed high levels of satisfaction with faculty status both theoretically and as actually experienced. The participants affirmed their satisfaction with the ACRL Standards as well. In response to the question, "Are you generally satisfied with the criteria in the ACRL Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians," 77% in 1982 and 82% in 1989 gave responses of "somewhat," "a great deal," or "completely." Findings on the librarians' satisfaction with faculty status were published in 1991.[12]

The present study of costs and benefits focuses primarily on eight criteria articulated in statements taken directly from the 1971 ACRL Standards. The survey participants rated each criterion using the following response categories:

- Clearly a cost
- Predominantly a cost
- Can't decide
- Predominantly a benefit
- Clearly a benefit

A large majority of the respondents perceived all of these criteria as "predominantly a benefit" or "clearly a benefit." See Table 1 for the statements and the tallies of the responses and Table 2 for the rank order of the criteria by percent of positive

TABLE 1
ACRL CRITERIA AS COSTS OR BENEFITS OF FACULTY STATUS
All Respondents

Criteria from "Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians"	Clearly A Cost		Predominantly A Cost		Can't Decide		Predominantly A Benefit		Clearly A Benefit	
	1982 % (N)	1989 % (N)	1982 % (N)	1989 % (N)	1982 % (N)	1969 % (N)	1982 % (N)	1989 % (N)	1982 % (N)	1989 % (N)
A necessary element of performance reviews should be an appraisal of peers who have access to all available evidence.	8 (8)	1 (1)	7 (7)	11 (10)	8 (8)	5 (4)	44 (46)	41 (36)	34 (35)	42 (37)
Librarians should form as a library faculty whose role and authority are similar to the faculties of a college, a school, or a department.	8 (8)	8 (7)	7 (7)	10 (9)	13 (13)	7 (6)	31 (32)	31 (27)	42 (44)	44 (39)
Librarians should be eligible for membership in the academic senate or equivalent body on the same basis as other faculty.	4 (4)	1 (1)	3 (3)	3 (3)	4 (4)	2 (2)	10 (10)	21 (18)	80 (83)	73 (64)
Librarians should be covered by tenure provisions the same as those of other faculty.	9 (9)	10 (9)	14 (15)	11 (10)	4 (4)	3 (3)	25 (26)	25 (22)	48 (50)	50 (44)
Librarians should be promoted through ranks and steps on the basis of their academic proficiency and professional effectiveness.	5 (5)	2 (2)	3 (3)	9 (8)	2 (2)	3 (3)	27 (28)	28 (25)	64 (66)	57 (50)
Librarians' promotion ladder should have the same titles, ranks, and steps as that of other faculty.	14 (14)	13 (11)	5 (5)	10 (9)	16 (17)	14 (12)	19 (20)	22 (19)	46 (48)	42 (37)
Sabbatical and other research leaves should be available to librarians on the same basis, and with the same requirements, as they are available to other faculty.	4 (4)	3 (3)	2 (2)	7 (6)	2 (2)	2 (2)	18 (19)	23 (20)	74 (77)	65 (57)
Librarians should have access to funding for research projects on the same basis as other faculty.	3 (3)	1 (1)	2 (2)	6 (5)	5 (5)	3 (3)	14 (15)	23 (20)	76 (79)	67 (59)

Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole number.

TABLE 2

CONDITIONS OF FACULTY STATUS AS BENEFITS*

All Respondents

1982		1989	
Short Title	**%**	**Short Title**	**%**
Eligible for research leaves	92	Eligible for faculty senate	94
Promotion criteria	91	Access to research funds	90
Eligible for faculty senate	90	Eligible for research leaves	88
Access to research funds	90	Promotion criteria	85
Peer review	78	Peer review	83
Faculty role and authority	73	Faculty role and authority	75
Eligible for tenure	73	Eligible for tenure	75
Same titles, ranks, steps	65	Same titles, ranks, steps	64

Responses are reported as percentages rounded to the nearest whole number
* Combined responses of "clearly a benefit" and "predominantly a benefit"

responses.

Librarians should be eligible for membership on the academic senate or equivalent body on the same basis as other faculty.

With a 94% rate of positive responses in 1989, this was the criterion most often named as a benefit in that survey. In 1982, 90% perceived it as a benefit. This distribution may be related to its prevalence.[13] The strongest consensus was among the male librarians (95% in 1982; 94% in 1989) and the administrators and supervisors (93% in 1982; 100% in 1989).

One respondent, who perceived this as a benefit, observed, "Faculty governance is extremely important on most campuses and can play a large role in faculty power." A respondent who felt that this was predominantly a cost wrote, ". . . this 'cost' requires the librarian to be fully cognizant of the issues facing academia. In addition, the librarian must face the reality of taking difficult positions for the benefit of the whole." A third, who was undecided as to whether this was a cost or a benefit, commented: "To be seen as equal, [librarians] must have membership on faculty bodies."

Sabbatical and other research leaves should be available to librarians on the same basis and with the same requirements as they are available to other faculty.

The respondents saw eligibility for sabbatical and research leaves as another of the especially important benefits of faculty status. It was the most frequently named benefit in 1982 (92%) and the third most frequently named in 1989 (88%). One librarian, who

saw this as a benefit, wrote, "The more research we do, the more we'll be seen as effective faculty members." Others pointed out that such leaves are not only a valuable benefit, but are necessary both for professional growth and to meet research and publishing requirements for promotion and tenure. A few respondents mentioned concerns about staffing when library faculty members are taking such leaves. Although librarians taking research leaves may have to retain responsibility for backlogged work after returning from leave, some of the workload is likely to be absorbed by the rest of the library staff. Thus, sabbatical and research leaves may often be a mixed benefit for the leave-taker and a cost for one or more of the leave-taker's colleagues.

In both surveys, the tenured respondents (93% in 1982; 88% in 1989), those with 5 to 10 years of experience (96% in 1982; 92% in 1989), and those from the colleges of arts and sciences (95% in 1982; 94% in 1989) were more likely than members of other groups to view research leaves as a benefit. It is not surprising that the tenured faculty members overwhelmingly saw this as a benefit since they are the beneficiaries of sabbatical leave policies. Other types of research leaves are generally available to library faculty regardless of tenure status, but such leaves are normally competitive and opportunities are limited.

Librarians should have access to funding for research projects on the same basis as other faculty.

Considered a benefit by 90% of the respondents in each survey, access to research funds was most favorably rated by the

respondents having professorial ranks and titles (100% in 1989), those with 5-10 years in the field (96% in 1982; 92% in 1989), and those working in community colleges or colleges of arts and sciences (95% for both types of institutions in 1982, and 93% and 94% respectively in 1989).

Between 1982 and 1989, the medical school librarians and the administrators naming this as a benefit declined 19 and 14 percentage points respectively; the former from 86% to 67% and the latter from 100% to 86%. On the other hand, the technical services librarians showed a ten percentage point increase in those characterizing this as a benefit (85% in 1982; 95% in 1989).

Perhaps some of those who perceived this as a cost had never received research funding themselves but had been required to assume the duties of colleagues who were working on funded research projects. It is also possible that some of them had invested time in preparing an ultimately unsuccessful proposal for research funding. Several respondents pointed out that there is a need for changes in funding of librarians' research, as librarians need adequate support to meet criteria for promotion and tenure and "are currently underfunded." Some mentioned competition with classroom faculty for research funding as a problem. One of the medical school librarians felt that librarians' research funding should be separate from that of other faculty, the implication being that librarians' research projects tend to be given a lower priority and thus, are less likely to be funded when all faculty members compete for research grants from the same pool of funds.[14] Another

respondent wondered if the usual outside funding sources such as federal agencies are adequately supporting library research projects.

Librarians should be promoted through ranks and steps on the basis of their academic proficiency and professional effectiveness.

The faculty model of promotion in rank based on academic proficiency and professional effectiveness was fourth in frequency of choice as a benefit in 1982 (90%) and second in 1989 (90%). The great majority of the respondents seemed to agree with the idea expressed by a respondent from a university center: "The separate track for promotion in rank is important for faculty. This is a significant benefit that allows librarians to advance within the same job description and not have to assume additional or different duties (e.g. become an administrator) in order to be promoted in rank."

Nevertheless, some respondents took issue with the inclusion of academic proficiency as a requirement. These individuals often cited their discomfort with librarians' using time and energy for scholarly and professional activities, in their opinion, to the possible detriment of their everyday library responsibilities.[15] Several respondents expressed the opinion that professional effectiveness should carry more weight than academic proficiency.[16] One of them put it this way, "Promotion should be based on effective job performance above all. Librarians are not provided with the free time needed for research and publication, so these aren't realistic measures of professionalism."

With respect to academic proficiency as a requirement for promotion, one respondent pointed out that improvements are needed in professional education to prepare aspiring academic librarians for academic faculty positions and responsibilities. If graduate schools of library science aren't doing this adequately, they must offer better and more appropriate programs and make explicit efforts to socialize aspiring academic librarians to understand and accept the faculty role.[17]

The most drastic change of opinion in the entire 1989 survey -- a decrease of 26 percentage points (from 93% in 1982 to 67% in 1989) -- took place among the medical school librarians regarding the benefits of promotion based on academic proficiency and professional effectiveness. One can only speculate as to what precipitated this significant divergence without questioning the respondents further. Despite that shift, however, it must be noted that more than two-thirds of these librarians continued to believe that this is a benefit.

Compared with their male colleagues, the women librarians more often experienced disappointment related to promotion in rank. Not only were the women less likely than the men to have declared candidacy for promotion, but they were also less likely to have experienced successful outcomes of their promotion reviews. In 1982, of the 17 respondents who had attempted promotion and had failed one or more times, 16 were women; in 1989, 8 of 11 candidates failing to win promotion were women. Moreover, all four of the 1982 respondents who had experienced only failure as

candidates for promotion were women, and in 1989, four of the six respondents who had experienced only failure were women. Seven of the 8 respondents in 1982 and 8 of the 11 in 1989 who thought that the promotion criteria in the ACRL Standards had been predominantly or clearly a cost for them were females. In contrast, one male respondent in 1982 and 2 in 1989 saw them as a cost.[18]

A necessary element of performance reviews should be an appraisal of peers who have access to all available evidence.

The process of peer review varies among institutions and even among the departments on a single campus, but whatever processes and procedures are used in the libraries participating in these surveys, peer review was appreciated as a benefit by 78% of the respondents in 1982 and 83% in 1989. Some saw it as a mixed benefit, however. They mentioned various problems with and abuses of peer evaluation, citing triviality, subjectivity, uneven application of evaluative criteria to individual candidates, incorrect assumptions that all peers are able to evaluate accurately the performance of a peer, and the situation of administrators who supervise peers being subject to formal peer review by colleagues who report to them.

Three respondents from the same university library offered different points of view about the ability of peers to evaluate one another's work. One felt that often peers know the most about and appreciate the quality of the work of colleagues, while another noted that it is difficult to evaluate peers doing dissimilar work.

The third gave this opinion: "Peer review is difficult at best and here it is tainted and damaging." The kinds of problems mentioned by the respondents usually are appropriately addressed on the institutional level where proper procedures and precautions must be employed to avoid or alleviate the kinds of anomalies to which the process of peer review is susceptible.[19]

One librarian expressed this conviction: "This is only a cost to those academic librarians who are 'one-dimensional.' Those who find faculty status a mark of distinction to be earned view outside evaluation as a validation of their work. The benefit [of peer review] is increased stature and acceptance in the broader community."

The more conspicuous changes in the responses between 1982 and 1989 reflected increases in the percentages of respondents characterizing peer review as a benefit. The positive response rates of the librarians with 20 or more years in the field (60% in 1982; 79% in 1989), administrators and supervisors (73% in 1982; 87% in 1989), librarians in areas such as interlibrary loan or circulation (69% in 1982; 88% in 1989), and librarians from the community colleges (77% in 1982; 93% in 1989) exhibited the most change.

Librarians should form as a library faculty whose role and authority are similar to the faculties of a college, school, or department.

Although library faculty activities are time-consuming and recommendations of library faculty committees are usually advisory

only, particularly when they involve personnel matters such as appointment, retention, promotion, tenure, academic rank, and discretionary salary increases, library faculty committee work affords librarians the opportunity to work together in different ways than the context of everyday duties allows. In large libraries, faculty activities give the librarians opportunities for professional interactions that may not otherwise be available at all.

About three-fourths of the respondents agreed that the organization of librarians as a faculty was a benefit. More of the respondents with 5 to 10 years in the field and more of the women respondents perceived this as a benefit in 1989 than in 1982. On the other hand, in 1989, fewer medical school librarians, technical services librarians, and librarians from the colleges of arts and sciences felt that this was a benefit.

Two librarians from the same university library expressed opposite views. One, who saw this as a benefit, remarked, "Our interests and the interests of the library users cannot be represented otherwise. It is to the benefit of the entire university to have library control of library affairs." The other, who saw this as a cost, wrote, "[The librarian's] role [is] not similar to [that of the] teaching faculty, We don't have autonomy, don't control our time; [our] obligation is many times that of teaching faculty. We are not seen [as peers] by teaching faculty and efforts in this direction dilute our effectiveness in our own arena."

Librarians should be covered by tenure provisions the same as those of other faculty.

Most of the respondents thought of eligibility for tenure as a benefit of faculty status. The strongest consensus was among the participants from the community colleges with 95% giving responses of "predominantly a benefit" or "clearly a benefit" in 1982, and 85% in 1989. Least enthusiastic about tenure provisions as a benefit in 1982 were the respondents from the university centers (58%) and in 1989, those from the medical school libraries (59%).

Approximately three quarters of the respondents having tenure signalled this as a benefit in both surveys (1982: 79%; 1989: 74%) and among the non-tenured respondents the results were 67% in 1982 and 74% in 1989. The technical services librarians showed a considerable decrease in those designating tenure provisions as a benefit (85% in 1982; 65% in 1989) while the administrators/ supervisors showed an increase (66% in 1982; 87% in 1989).

A respondent from a community college, who saw eligibility for tenure as predominantly a cost, elaborated, "The cost of this is the need to engage in teaching, research, and publication. The benefit is greater visibility on the campus." Another respondent, who saw tenure as predominantly a benefit, acknowledged that someone about to become unemployed following an unsuccessful tenure review would very likely see this as a cost, but "otherwise, it's definitely a benefit."

An undecided respondent pointed out that achieving tenure is "very difficult" when librarians are evaluated according to the

same criteria and the process is "ruled by the same procedures and policies [that govern the evaluation] of other faculty." Numerous comments from respondents holding various opinions about this as a cost or benefit cited difficulties in meeting tenure requirements similar to those of other faculty when librarians do not have comparable support and opportunity to meet those requirements.[20] A librarian from a university offered this comment: "Librarians' work assignments are too heavy to afford time for research as it is available for teaching faculty." One respondent suggested that it might be helpful if the timetable for tenure reviews were extended for librarians to help offset the time limitations in their normal work schedules for professional and scholarly activities.

Librarians' promotion ladder should have the same titles, ranks, and steps as that of other faculty.

The issue of librarians' having the same titles, ranks, and steps as other faculty, though seen as a benefit by almost two-thirds of the respondents, garnered the weakest consensus as clearly or predominantly a benefit. Written comments suggested that some respondents were afraid that attached to the titles would be the expectation that librarians meet the identical standards established for teaching faculty. Some said they preferred that librarians have titles related directly to their work because of confusion that could otherwise arise over the kinds and levels of expectations for scholarly contributions from librarians. Others felt that a professor's job is teaching and that librarians would have to be teachers in order to be appropriately called

"professor." One of them stated, "We're not the same and shouldn't pretend to be. No Ph.D., little research training. . ." Others did not share these concerns; they felt that identical academic ranks and titles foster feelings of unity and equality among all academic faculty members.

In both surveys, this criterion also evoked the most uncertainty as to whether it is a cost or a benefit. Few of these respondents had the same titles, ranks, and steps as other academic faculty, a fact which could very well account for the elevated level of indecision. The only respondents actually holding professorial ranks and titles were from the community college population. Not surprisingly, these librarians had the highest regard for this benefit.[21] If there is a positive correlation between identical academic ranks and titles and other faculty benefits and if librarians with professorial titles are more satisfied with faculty status, as these survey findings and some other studies suggest, it would seem that such titles could not be considered costs of faculty status.[22] Rather, they would appear to be benefits that symbolize the acceptance of the librarians as peers among the academic faculty members at their institutions.

CONCLUSIONS

In response to the question, "In general, for you as an individual, do the benefits of faculty status outweigh the costs?" sixty-six percent of the participants in each of the surveys, 1982 and 1989, gave responses of "somewhat," "a great deal," or

"completely." While the total rate of positive responses remained constant, in 1989, the response "completely" rose by 9 percentage points and the response "a great deal" by 6 percentage points. This suggests a modest gain in positive feelings among these respondents.

A respondent from a university center summed up his or her feeling: "The key elements for me are the opportunity for promotion within job title, the ability to define our criteria for promotion and tenure (within the parameters established by the SUNY Board of Trustees), and peer review. In SUNY, only academic faculty have these rights. Most NTP's [non-teaching professionals] do not. Therefore, there is no way I can perceive these things as costs." Another respondent explained why he or she felt that the benefits outweighed the costs, "As a librarian, I have found that placing my credentials and the record of my activities before the campus community has only served to increase my effectiveness as a member of that community. In all activities, when one 'earns one's stripes' the rewards can be significant."

A university center librarian, who felt that the benefits of faculty status "somewhat" outweighed the costs, perceived as costs: the pressure to write, do research, and be active in professional organizations while [maintaining] heavy job responsibilities; being passed over for promotions and [merit] pay raises for not being active enough [in professional and scholarly activities] though one is hardworking; the personal money librarians have to spend to join organizations and go to conferences; the drain of

good employees; and the loss of time, work, and quality of service by the library when librarians' energies are directed elsewhere.[23] The same respondent cited as benefits: better pay, greater autonomy in running the library, respect from academic faculty, and freedom to grow professionally.

Although solid majorities reported favorable perceptions of the benefits of faculty status vis-à-vis its costs, every one of the criteria was perceived as a cost by one or more of the respondents. In response to the question, "In general, for you as an individual, do the benefits of faculty status outweigh the costs," 28% in 1982 and 26% in 1989 chose the response "not at all." Among this minority, gender was the demographic variable most frequently shared: 22 of 29 of these respondents in 1982 and 19 of 23 in 1989 were women. The strongest negative comment was made by one of these women: "I have seen little benefit accrue to the institution or to individuals via faculty status as it is in effect here."

Most of the written comments of the respondents who expressed reservations about some of the ACRL criteria as benefits indicated that their reservations had a good deal to do with the requirement of "academic proficiency." Many of the librarians who had mixed feelings about the inclusion of "academic proficiency" as an evaluative criterion for promotion seemed to think that it was too difficult to have to provide exemplary year round library service while having to excel at other kinds of faculty activities such as participation in faculty governance, research and publishing,

university and community service, and assuming responsibilities in professional organizations. The irony is that academic proficiency appears to be expected of librarians (or at least valued) as a criterion for promotion and tenure in almost all academic libraries, including those where the librarians do not have faculty status.[24]

In spite of frustrations with conditions of employment that often conflict with the requirements of academic proficiency and professional effectiveness as criteria for reappointment, promotion, and tenure, most of the responses revealed that the librarians who participated in these surveys appreciate the benefits of faculty status and they want to retain that status. This should not be surprising, as the opportunity to participate fully in campus life and the unique kinds of possibilities for professional growth afforded by faculty status in the academic community are among the most distinctive and rewarding features of academic librarianship. These aspects of the work of academic librarians provide intellectual stimulation and enrich the librarians' work in ways that are not usually available in other kinds of library settings.

It is the conclusion of this investigator that if the librarians who participated in these surveys are typical, a solid majority of the members of this profession possessing faculty status value their faculty status and believe that its benefits outweigh its costs.

NOTES

1. Montanelli found that librarians' research activities are bringing significant benefits both to the individual librarian and to the institution served. These benefits include job advancement, personal recognition, improved relations with teaching faculty, increased responsiveness to change and innovation, and better library service through shared knowledge and experience. In another study, Kingma chose to exclude such values to focus entirely on the economics of faculty status from the standpoint of institutional dollars expended to support the librarians' faculty activities and functions.

2. This appears to influence librarians' satisfaction with faculty status. Benedict (1991) hypothesized from results of surveys of New York academic libraries published in 1982 and 1991, that a positive correlation exists between librarian satisfaction with faculty status and institutional compliance with the ACRL Standards. It would follow that the same may be said of librarians' perceptions of the costs and benefits of faculty status.

3. Association of College and Research Libraries, "Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians," College & Research Libraries News 33:210-12 (Sept. 1971). A revised version of these standards was published in 1991. The criteria used for the 1982 and 1989 SUNY surveys were based on the 1971 version, which included the statement "The librarians' promotion ladder

should have the same titles, ranks, and steps as that of other faculty." This statement was deleted from the 1991 revision.

4. From a combined random sample of U.S. institutions of higher education and all of the member libraries of the Association of Research Libraries (ARL), Lowry found that in 67% of these institutions the librarians were considered to have faculty status. Several earlier studies and estimates also found that more than 50% of academic libraries accorded faculty or academic status to librarians, for example, Benedict (1983), Byerly, De Pew, English, Hare, Hill, Kenney, Manchikes, Payne, Rayman, and Tassin. Kemper observed, however, that when the ACRL Standards for faculty status were specifically adhered to, the percentage of libraries granting faculty status declined from 67% to 6% in the survey described by Lowry.

5. For widely accepted definitions of "faculty status" and "academic status" see the ALA Glossary of Library and Information Science (Chicago: American Library Association, 1983). The ALA definitions do not exactly describe the conditions of faculty status of librarians in the State University of New York system (SUNY), as there may be both academic faculty members and other faculty members on a given SUNY campus. The Policies of the Board of Trustees state that professional personnel having academic rank and term or continuing appointment (i.e. most of the librarians and all instructional faculty), comprise the academic faculty of SUNY. The Chancellor, the chief administrative officer, and "such other officers of administration and staff members of the college as may

be specified by the faculty bylaws of the college" (11) are also members of the faculty. Thus, on some campuses, (Albany, for example) professionals not holding academic ranks are members of the faculty, although they are not members of the academic faculty.

6. Lowry found that the authority of the ACRL Standards and the Joint Statement on Faculty Status of College and University Librarians has not yet been established in most institutions. These two documents are found in Kroll, Academic Status: Statements and Resources.

7. Numerous surveys have produced corroborative results. See, for example, Benedict, (1983), Byerly, Davidson, English (1984), Galloway, Gavryck, Gray, Hawkins, Highfill, Hopson, Jackson, Kreh, Krompart, Manchikes, Pontius, Reeling, Ryans, Stefani, Walden, Weatherford, and Westerman.

8. Werrell refers to "the decision of ACRL -- and academic librarians in general -- to ride the coattails of teaching faculty," citing authors such as DePew, Robert Pierson [no citation provided], and Meyer, as representatives of this point of view. Biggs (1981) claimed: ". . . librarians demand some or all of the same benefits enjoyed by faculty, though they are somewhat less enthusiastic about being judged by equivalent standards for promotion and tenure," continuing, ". . . librarians reach out for the ready-made status of an obviously respected profession." Mason asked: ". . . are we after a cushy version of it -- all the benefits and none of the stress? No grinding demands for doctoral degrees? No pressures for publication? No termination if tenure

is denied?" Wilson examined the sociological concept of organization fiction, concluding that in an attempt to bolster their own self-image, librarians have made a false claim to a status that should be reserved for the professoriat. Benedict (1983) found in a survey of New York libraries that more of the responsibilities of faculty status had been accorded to librarians than the presumed rewards. Benedict (1991) also found that the majority of SUNY librarians were satisfied with faculty status. These findings suggest that the majority of academic librarians do not seek faculty status merely to enjoy the ready-made status of a respected profession. Those who have been socialized to accept both the responsibilities and the rewards of faculty status understand and accept that the benefits are accompanied by responsibilities.

9. Opinion pieces by individuals include those by Axford, Brody, Meskill, Moriarty, and St. Clair, who offered their thoughts on the advantages and disadvantages of faculty status. Davey looked at the "benefits and responsibilities". Sherby examined the pros and cons. Moore considered the "problems and perks". Meyer conducted a survey containing two questions "to determine the respondents' attitude toward faculty status five years ago and today." [The precise wording of those two questions was not included in the article.] Davidson elicited answers to two questions: "What do you like about faculty status?" and "What don't you like about faculty status?" Smith queried the librarians in three libraries on the "advantages and problems" associated with faculty status.

10. Librarians from the same institutions participated in this investigator's surveys in 1982 and 1989, with the exception of one of the community colleges.

11. In 1968, the SUNY Board of Trustees granted faculty status to librarians. For more information on the history of faculty status in the SUNY system see Devinney, Gavryck, Hubbard, Kreh, and Madan.

12. Benedict, 1991.

13. Krompart found that this was the standard most often achieved by librarians.

14. In SUNY, separate funding has resulted in increased opportunities for librarians' professional development. In contracts negotiated by the faculty union, United University Professions (UUP), from 1985 to 1995, a separate category of university funding was established for librarians' professional development. This program provided time and funding for study, research, and other kinds of professional growth. Although this proved to be a useful program, it failed to provide a reliable source of funding for librarians' professional and scholarly activities because it is subject to the vagaries of contract negotiation, a process which has become increasingly difficult and protracted. The contract expired June 30, 1995 and two years later, negotiation of a new contract had not yet been effected. As a result, the librarians' principal source of support for professional development was unavailable for several years. This can and will continue to happen every time the contract must be renegotiated unless a contract providing for renewal of this

program is in effect without interruption upon expiration of the prior contract. Librarians would be much better served by a dependable program that is not subject to years of suspension every time the contract expires. NB: Community college librarians are not affiliated with UUP; thus, they were not included in this particular professional development program.

15. This argument is frequently made in the literature by those who believe that faculty status is not appropriate for librarians because of its concomitant scholarly and professional aspects.

16. Lowry found that job performance was the primary evaluative criterion in more than 95% of the libraries he queried. This has been confirmed by other researchers as well.

17. In 1978, Schmidt discussed the question of preparation for academic librarianship, calling it a problem area and suggesting that ". . . the process of socializing [the library school graduates who will hold faculty appointments] to the responsibilities of these appointments, while not exclusively that of library schools, must at least begin with them." Davey admonished library schools for not requiring a thesis for the MLS degree, saying that library schools should better prepare students for what is to come. Biggs (1981) suggested that library schools should upgrade their programs in length, rigor, and opportunities for specialization and theoretical research components. Anderson concluded after studying 60 college catalogs that library schools were not adequately preparing students for faculty responsibilities related to research. Page's analysis of library school catalogs

and of advertisements for academic library positions led her to conclude that neither the graduate school catalogs nor the announcements of the employers showed evidence of concern for the inculcation of the value system of the faculty which college and university librarians must accept in order to perform comfortably as faculty members.

18. In 1982, this represented 10% (7) of the women respondents and 3% (1) of the men respondents; in 1989, it represented 14% (8) of the women and 6% (2) of the men, disproportionate to their representation in the survey population as a whole.

19. Problems with peer review have been frequently cited in the literature.

20. The question of adequate and appropriate support and opportunity has been the subject of much discussion in print and in libraries for a long time and requires much more vigorous action toward a satisfactory solution by ALA/ACRL, by campus administrators, and by other interested groups and individuals, including the librarians themselves.

21. Benedict, 1991. As a group, the community college librarians also expressed more satisfaction with faculty status than that expressed by the other groups surveyed.

22. Benedict (1983) found such a correlation. The librarians from the two-year colleges had been more often accorded certain perquisites associated with faculty employment -- especially academic year appointment -- than the librarians from other kinds of institutions of higher learning.

23. Many of these perceived costs have been discussed in published articles. For SUNY, however, the assumption that there is a drain of good employees because of requirements associated with faculty status is not supported by evidence from exit interviews. David Kreh, UUP (United University Professions)/SUNYLA (State University of New York Librarians Association) liaison, who has collected and studied exit interviews for a number of years reported in a personal interview that he had not perceived any pattern of librarians' departures being related to faculty status.

24. Pontius reported in a 1978 study that within a group of ARL libraries where the librarians did not have faculty status, 76% reported that research and publishing were part of the criteria used to evaluate librarians for promotion and tenure.

REFERENCES

Anderson, David G. and Christina Landram. "Resolved: Library Schools Do Not Meet Their Goals and Objectives in Training Academic Librarians to Perform Research," paper prepared for the Fourth National Conference of the Association of College and Research Libraries, Baltimore, MD, April 9-12, 1986, ERIC Document Reproduction Service ED280461.

Association of College and Research Libraries. "Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians," College & Research Libraries News 33 (Sept. 1972): 210-12.

Association of Research Libraries, Office of Management Studies, Systems and Procedures Exchange Center. The Status of Librarians: An Overview (SPEC Kit No. 61) (Washington, DC: ARL, 1980).

Axford, William. "The Identity Crisis of Academic Librarianship," Utah Libraries, 19 (Spring 1976): 10-18.

Benedict, Marjorie A. "Librarians' Satisfaction with Faculty

Status," College & Research Libraries 52 (Nov. 1991): 538-548.

___, Jacquelyn A. Gavryck, and Hanan C. Selvin. "Status of Academic Librarians in New York State," College & Research Libraries 44 (Jan. 1983): 12-19.

Biggs, Mary. "Sources of Tension and Conflict between Librarians and Faculty," Journal of Higher Education 52 (Mar.-Apr. 1981): 182-210.

___. "Librarians As Educators: Assessing Our Self-Image." Public & Access Services Quarterly 1 (1995): 41-50.

Brody, Catherine T. "Faculty Status for Academic Librarians: the Dream and the Reality," Bookmark 45 (Fall 1986):42-47.

Byerly, Greg. "The Faculty Status of Academic Librarians in Ohio," College & Research Libraries 41 (Sept. 1980): 422-429.

Davey, Nancy and Theodora Andrews. "Implications of Faculty Status for University Librarians, with Special Attention to Tenure," Journal of Academic Librarianship 4 (May 1978): 71-4.

Davidson, Russ, Connie Capers Thorson, and Margo C. Trumpeter. "Faculty Status for Librarians in the Rocky Mountain Region: A Review and Analysis," College & Research Libraries 42 (May 1981): 203-13.

De Pew, John N. "The ACRL Standards for Faculty Status: Panacea or Placebo?" College & Research Libraries 44 (Nov. 1983): 407-13.

Devinney, Gemma. "The 1965-1974 Faculty Status Movement As an Effort with Social Movement Characteristics: A Case Study of the State University of New York" (Ph.D. diss., University at Buffalo, State University of New York, 1987).

English, Thomas G. "Administrators' Views of Library Personnel Status," College & Research Libraries 45 (May 1984): 189-95.

___. "Librarian Status at Eighty-Nine U.S. Academic Institutions of the Association of Research Libraries," College & Research Libraries 44 (May 1983): 199-211.

Galloway, R. Dean. "Status or Stasis: Academic Librarians 10 Years Later," American Libraries 10 (June 1979): 349-52.

Gavryck, Jacquelyn A. "The SUNY Librarians' Faculty Status Game,"

Journal of Academic Librarianship 1 (July 1975): 11-13.

Gray, Becky Bolte and Rosalee McReynolds. "A Comparison of Academic Libraries with and without Faculty Status in the Southeast," College & Research Libraries 44 (July 1983): 283-87.

Hare, Ann. "Professional Development in the 1980's in College Libraries in the Southeast," Southeastern Librarian 39 (1989): 18-19.

Hawkins, Jo Anne, and others. The Status of Status: The Status of Librarians in Texas Academic Libraries. ([Austin?]: Texas Library Association, 1978, ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED178042.

Highfill, William C. "Current Status of Librarians at Auburn University," The Alabama Librarian 27 (Mar. 1976): 2-4.

Hill, Fred and Robert Hauptman. "A New Perspective on Faculty Status," College & Research Libraries 47 (Mar. 1986): 156-59.

Hopson, Rex C. A Study of Academic Librarians' Salaries and Privileges. (Albuquerque: New Mexico University, Zimmerman Library, 1974), ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED098958.

Hubbard, Terry and John Mielke. Faculty Status for Librarians in the State University of New York, A Short History. (Stony Brook and Albany: State University of New York, 1975), ERIC document reproduction service, ED114044.

Jackson, Bonnie Jean. "Status of Academic Librarians in Louisiana," Louisiana Library Association Bulletin 39 (Winter 1977): 99-104.

Kemper, Ann L. "Faculty Status of Theological Librarians in the American Theological Library Association," Journal of Religious & Theological Information 2 (1994): 1-16.

Kenney, Donald J. and Gail McMillan. "Librarians in Academic Limbo: Support for Scholarship," Southeastern Librarian 39 (Winter 1989): 139-41.

Kingma, Bruce R. and Gillian M. McCombs. "The Opportunity Costs of Faculty Status for Academic Librarians," College & Research Libraries 56 (May 1995): 258-264.

Kreh, David H. "Faculty Status and Collective Bargaining: SUNY Libraries," Bookmark 40 (Summer 1982): 195-99.

Kroll, Susan. Academic Status: Statements and Resources. Chicago: Academic Status Committee, ACRL: 1994.

Krompart, Janet and Clara DiFelice. "A Review of Faculty Status Surveys, 1971-1984," Journal of Academic Librarianship 13 (Mar. 1987): 14-18.

Lowry, Charles B. "The Status of Faculty Status for Academic Librarians: A Twenty-year Perspective," College & Research Libraries 54 (March 1993): 163-72.

Madan, Raj, Eliese Hetler, and Marilyn Strong. "The Status of Librarians in Four-Year State Colleges and Universities," College & Research Libraries 29 (Sept. 1968): 381-86.

Manchikes, Alice and George Crabb. "A Survey of Faculty Status Policies for Librarians in Kentucky and Surrounding States," Southeastern Librarian 26 (Winter 1976): 219-225.

Mason, Ellsworth. "A Short Happy View of Our Emulation of Faculty," College & Research Libraries 33 (Nov. 1972): 445-46.

Meyer, Richard W. "Faculty Status and Academic Librarians: Are There Second Thoughts?" North Carolina Libraries 39 (Winter 1981): 41-47.

Meskill, Victor D. and L. Drewe Meskill. "Let's Consider the Faculty Status of Librarians," Educational Horizons 53 (Summer 1975): 176-80.

Montanelli, Dale S. and Patricia F. Stenstrom. "The Benefits of Research for Academic Librarians and the Institutions Which They Serve." Energies for Transition (Proceedings of the Fourth National Conference of the Association of College and Research Libraries, Baltimore, Maryland, April 9-12, 1986), ed. Danuta A. Nitecki (Chicago: Association of College and Research Libraries, 1986), 18-20.

Moore, Richard E. "Academic Librarianship: A Case Study," Technicalities 2 (July 1982): 8+.

Moriarty, John H. "Academic in Deed," College & Research Libraries 31 (Jan. 1970):14-17.

Page, Jacquelin Marie. "The Pursuit of Professional Identity for Librarianship within American Higher Education: A Study of Educational Programs and Work Requirements in Socialization for Academic Identity in the 1980's." (Ph.D. diss., Saint Louis University, 1990).

Payne, Joyce and Janet Wagner. "Librarians, Publication, and Tenure," College & Research Libraries, 45 (Mar. 1984): 133-39.

Policies of the Board of Trustees. [Albany?]: State University of New York, 1993.

Pontius, Jack E., Cordelia W. Swinton, and Frederick J. Van Antwerp. Faculty Status, Research Requirements, and Released Time ([State College, PA: Pennsylvania State University], 1978), ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED183147.

Rayman, Ronald and Frank William Goudy. "Research and Publication Requirements in University Libraries, " College & Research Libraries 41 (Jan. 1980): 43-48.

Reeling, Patricia and Beryl K. Smith. "Faculty Status: A Realistic Survey," New Jersey Libraries 16 (Fall 1983): 17-25.

Ryans, Cynthia C. "The Academic Status of the Professional Librarian: An Empirical Report," Ohio Library Association Bulletin, 47 (Jan. 1977): 6-8.

Schmidt, C. James. "Faculty Status in Academic Libraries: Retrospective and Prospect," in New Horizons for Academic Libraries (Papers presented at the First National Conference of the Association of College and Research Libraries, Boston: Nov. 8-11, 1978) eds. R.D. Stueart and R. D. Johnson (New York: Saur, 1979), 416.

Sherby, Louise. "Academic Librarian: Librarian or Faculty Member?" in Essays from the New England Academic Librarians' Writing Seminar, ed. Norman Stevens (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow, 1980), 52-54.

Smith, John Brewster. "Faculty Status of Librarians in Three ARL Member Research Libraries in New York State: A Case Study." (Ph.D. diss., Columbia University, 1991).

St. Clair, Gloriana and Irene Hoadley. "The Challenge to Faculty Status: A Call to Militancy," Wilson Library Bulletin 63 (Dec. 1988): 23-24,26.

Stefani, JoAnn and Susan H. Smith. "The Status of Academic Librarians in Mississippi," Mississippi Libraries 45 (Spring 1981): 10-12.

TerHaar, Linda K. "The Duke Model of Librarian Status: An Alternative to Faculty Status for Academic Librarians." (Master's thesis, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 1989).

Tassin, Anthony G. "Faculty Status for Librarians: Progress and Perplex," LLA Bulletin 47 (Fall 1984): 83-86.

Walden, Winston, A. "Academic Status of Librarians in State-supported Nondoctorate-granting, Four-year Colleges and Universities." (Ph.D. diss., Southern Illinois University, 1985).

Weatherford, John. "Librarians in Faculty Unions: Collective Bargaining in Academe", Library Journal 99 (Oct. 1, 1974): 2443-46.

Werrell, Emily and Laura Sullivan. "Faculty Status for Academic Librarians: A Review of the Literature," College & Research Libraries 48 (Mar. 1987): 95-103.

Westerman, Mel. "Salary Comparisons between Academic Librarians and Instructional Faculty," College & Research Libraries 43 (July 1982): 346-51.

Wilson, Pauline. "Librarians As Teachers: The Study of an Organization Fiction," Library Quarterly 49 (April 1979): 146-62.

APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

Type of Institution	% (N) 1982	% (N) 1989
University Center	49 (51)	51 (45)
Four-year College	16 (17)	19 (17)
Two-year College	21 (22)	16 (14)
Grad./Prof. School	14 (14)	14 (12)
	100 (104)	100 (88)

Primary Area of Responsibility	1982	1989
Reference/Collection Development	54 (56)	37 (33)
Technical Services	19 (20)	26 (23)
Administration/Supervision	14 (15)	17 (15)
Other Services	10 (10)	7 (6)
Combined assignment	3 (3)	13 (11)
	100 (104)	100 (38)

Academic Rank	1982	1989
Assistant Librarian	20 (21)	9 (8)
Senior Assistant Librarian	23 (24)	28 (25)
Associate Librarian	27 (28)	31 (27)
Librarian	10 (10)	17 (15)
Instructor	unknown	1 (1)
Assistant Professor	unknown	5 (4)
Associate Professor	unknown	2 (2)
Professor	unknown	3 (3)
Other**	20 (21)	0 (0)
No response	0 (0)	3 (3)
	100 (104)	99 (88)

Promotion History	1982	1989
One or more successful attempts for promotion; no failures	38 (39)	48 (42)
Mixed success: both successful and unsuccessful attempts for promotion	13 (13)	6 (5)
Never attempted promotion	44 (46)	33 (29)
All promotion attempts were unsuccessful	4 (4)	7 (6)
No response	2 (2)	7 (6)
	101*(104)	101* (88)

Years of Experience	1982		1989	
0 - 5 years	20	(21)	16	(14)
5 - 10 years	24	(25)	15	(13)
10 - 20 years	41	(43)	38	(33)
20+ years	14	(15)	32	(28)
	100	(104)	100	(88)

Tenure	1982		1989	
Tenured	56	(58)	66	(58)
Nontenured	43	(45)	34	(30)
No response	1	(1)	0	(0)
	100	(104)	100	(88)

Gender	1982		1989	
Female	66	(69)	65	(57)
Male	34	(35)	35	(31)
	100	(104)	100	(88)

Education	1982		1989	
MLS Highest Degree	46	(48)	49	(43)
MLS plus MA or MS	45	(47)	42	(37)
Doctorate (plus Masters= 6% and 6%)	7	(7)	9	(8)
No Response	2	(2)	0	(0)
	100	(104)	100	(88)

*Does not equal 100 percent because of rounding.
**In 1982 these respondents did not specify their ranks and titles, but most are presumed to have had professorial titles.

APPENDIX B

ABSTRACT OF 1989 QUESTIONNAIRE

[Multiple choice response categories were provided for questions 1-9]

1. In what type of institution is your library located?

2. Please indicate your primary area of responsibility.

3. Please indicate the degrees you have earned.

4. Do you have tenure or continuing appointment? [The SUNY trustees use the term "continuing appointment" rather than the word "tenure."]

5. How long have you worked in an academic library since completing your graduate degree in library science?

6. If you have been a candidate for promotion in rank in the library where you are now employed, what was your experience?
   - Attempted promotion once and was successful
   - Successful in achieving more than one promotion
   - Attempted promotion more than once before achieving success
   - Attempted promotion, but was never successful
   - Does not apply

7. What is your present academic rank?

8. Please indicate whether you are male or female.

9. If you had a choice in your present job, what kind of status would you choose for yourself?

Response codes for questions 10-15:

Not at all Somewhat A Great deal Completely

10. To what extent do you feel like a full-fledged faculty member?

11. All things considered, do you think it is fitting for librarians to have academic status resembling that of instructional faculty?

12. Generally speaking, are you satisfied with faculty status as it is defined and practiced in your library?

13. In general, for you as an individual, do the benefits of faculty status outweigh the costs?

14. Do you think that faculty status enriches the careers of academic librarians? (1989) Do you think that faculty status has upgraded the profession of academic librarianship? (1982)

15. Are you generally satisfied with the criteria in the ACRL Standards for Faculty Status for College and University Librarians?

16. It would be in the best interests of academic librarians to work harder to achieve equitable status as faculty members.
Disagree strongly Disagree moderately Can't decide
Agree moderately Agree strongly

17-24. [Eight statements from the ACRL Standards which the respondents rated as: "Clearly a cost," "Predominantly a cost," "Clearly a benefit," " Predominantly a benefit," or "Can't decide." [See Table 1 for the statements]